

**State of Idaho**  
**Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund**  
**Intended Use Plan**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction .....	1
II. List of Projects .....	3
III. Long-term and short-term goals .....	3
A. Long-term goals	
B. Short-term goals	
IV. Information on the SRF activities to be supported .....	4
A. Allocation of funds	
B. Administrative costs of the SRF	
C. Loan eligible activities	
V. Assurances and specific proposals .....	4
VI. Criteria and method for distribution of funds .....	6
VII. Additional information requirements .....	8
A. Public review and comment	
B. Bypass procedures	

Attachments

- I. List of Fundable Projects
- II. State FY 2006 Approved Priority List
- III. Integrated Priority Rating
- IV. Proposed Payment Schedule
- V. Public Participation Information

## **IDAHO REVOLVING FUND**

### **INTENDED USE PLAN**

**June 23, 2005 BOARD APPROVED**

#### **I. Introduction**

The State of Idaho, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) proposes to adopt the following Intended Use Plan (IUP) for state fiscal year 2006 (July 1 through June 30) as required under Section 606c of the Clean Water Act.

The primary purpose of the IUP is to identify the proposed annual intended use of the funds available in Idaho's Water Pollution Control Loan Account. Projects on the priority list, from which this IUP was derived, have been reviewed by the public in accordance with Idaho's Administrative Procedures Act (Idaho Code 67-5201 et. seq.) and approved by the State Board of Environmental Quality.

The IUP includes the following:

- lists of prospective loan projects including payment schedules for those most likely to qualify for a loan
- long-term and short-term goals
- assurances and specific proposals
- criteria and methods for distribution of funds
- attachments relevant to the above

Available funding for projects during fiscal year 2006 is estimated to be \$43,051,508 as documented in the worksheet on the following page. This methodology of estimating funding should accelerate the pace of drawing down the cash balance of the fund by recognizing revenues out two years and obligating against those revenues. In the past revenues were only recognized for one year.

**Resources:**

**Cash on Hand 4/1/05** \$80,904,140

**EPA Capitalization Grant FFY2004** 313,010

**State Match** 111,584

**EPA Capitalization Grant FFY2005** 5,243,500

**State Match** 1,048,700

**Loans Receivable:**

**SFY 2005 (4/1/05-6/30/05)** 1,082,682

**SFY 2006** 4,400,532

**SFY 2007** 5,884,475

**Interest on Cash**

**SFY 2005 (4/1/05-6/30/05)** 525,000

**SFY 2006** 2,100,000

**SFY 2007** 2,200,000

**Total Resources:**

\$103,813,623

**Current Remaining Loan Obligations:** (\$63,960,121)

(Loans in construction less disbursements)

Add back: 5%Project shrinkage 3,198,006

(Some projects will self-finance and

Reduce disbursement requests from  
the CWSRF)

**Net Remaining Loan Obligations:**

(60,762,115)

**NET RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO LOAN**

**\$43,051,508**

**Key Assumptions:**

Projects take 28 months to construct and close from date of loan signing. **Total Resources** for next 27 months to allow best analysis, except for: FFY 2006 CWSRF Capitalization Grant and Match not yet appropriated

New loan obligations cannot exceed **NET RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO LOAN**. Next projection will be 7/1/2005 or when loans signed from 4/1/05 forward exceed this amount, whichever event comes first.

## II. **List of Projects**

Attachment I, List of Fundable Projects, contains the projects expected to be funded that were selected from the FY2006 SRF Project Priority List which is Attachment II. Projects are arranged on the list in priority order. Both project lists were presented in a public hearing on May 16, 2005.

The first use requirement of the Act [Section 602(b)(5)], relating to National Municipal Policy (NMP) does not apply in Idaho since all NMP needs have been met with separate funds in the form of state and federal grants and separate state loans in FFY89.

## III. **Long-and Short-Term Goals**

DEQ's long-term goals are to:

1. Protect public health and the waters of the state by offering financial assistance for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities.
2. Assist local communities as they strive to achieve and maintain statewide compliance with federal and state water quality standards.
3. Administer Idaho's Water Pollution Control Loan Account to ensure its financial integrity, viability and revolving nature in perpetuity.

DEQ's short-term goals are to:

1. Perform all necessary tasks to assure that all loan assistance requested from FFY2005 funding is provided for projects on the list in a timely manner.
2. Provide funding for the non-point source projects when they are identified in Attachment I. A major component of this goal will be an improved marketing effort directed at potential sponsors of non-point source projects.
3. Address long-term funding for SRF administrative costs when capitalization grants are no longer provided. This goal is carried over from the previous fiscal year. While some possible alternatives have been explored, a permanent solution has not been determined. The effort this year will be to finalize the process including:

- Determining a source of funding administrative costs
- Obtaining EPA approval to use administrative funds

## IV. **Information on the Activities to be Supported**

### A. Allocation of funds.

The primary type of assistance to be provided by the SRF is expected to be low interest

loans for up to 100% of project costs. The rate of interest in State FY2006 will be 3.25% for loans awarded directly by DEQ. Loans to the Idaho Soil Conservation Commission will be at 2%. All loans will be paid back over a period not to exceed 20 years. Principal and interest repayments must begin no later than one year after the initiation of operation date.

B. Administrative Costs of the SRF.

DEQ plans to reserve not more than four percent of the capitalization grant for administrative expenses.

C. Loan Eligible Activities.

SRF loans will provide for planning, design and construction of secondary, advanced secondary, interceptors and appurtenances for infiltration/inflow correction, collector sewers and rehabilitation. SRF loan assistance will be provided to local communities, counties, sewer districts, and non-profit sewer associations for the construction of publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities. Loans may also be provided to sponsors of non-point source projects to implement water pollution control projects. Such projects must be consistent with the State Water Quality Management Plan and demonstrate a nexus or benefit to a municipality.

V. **Assurances and Specific Proposals**

A. Environmental Reviews - 602(a)

DEQ certifies that it will conduct environmental reviews of each wastewater treatment project receiving assistance from the SRF. DEQ will follow EPA approved NEPA-like procedures in conjunction with environmental reviews.

These procedures are outlined in Section 01.12041 of the state Rules for Administration of Water Pollution Control Loans. More detailed procedures are embodied in the Wastewater Facilities Loan Account Handbook of Procedures (Chapter 5).

B. Binding Commitments - 602(b)(3)

DEQ will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly payment within one year of receipt of that payment. Binding commitment dates are listed in Section VI of this plan.

C. Expeditious and Timely Expenditures - 602(b)(4)

DEQ will expend all funds in the SRF in a timely and expeditious manner.

D. First Use Enforceable Requirements - 602(b)(5)

DEQ certifies that all major and minor WWTF's that the state has previously identified as part of the National Municipal Policy Universe are:

- (a) in compliance, or
- (b) on an enforceable schedule, or
- (c) have an enforcement action filed, or
- (d) have a funding commitment during or prior to the first year covered by an IUP.

E. Compliance with Title II Requirements - 602(b)(6)

DEQ believes it has met the specific statutory requirements for publicly-owned wastewater treatment projects constructed in whole or in part before FY 1995 with funds directly made available by federal capitalization grants. Therefore, DEQ no longer plans to use its federal capitalization grant and state match on "equivalency projects". These projects meet the sixteen specific statutory requirements provided by Section 602(b)(6) of the Clean Water Act as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1987, Public Law 100-4 and are eligible under 201(b), 201(g)(1) and (2), 201(N) and 211.

However, DEQ agrees to comply with and to require recipients of loans from Idaho's Water Pollution Control Loan Account to comply with applicable federal cross-cutting requirements. DEQ will notify EPA when consultation or coordination by EPA is necessary to resolve issues regarding these requirements.

F. State Matching Funds - 602(b)(2)

DEQ agrees to deposit into the SRF from state monies an amount equal to twenty percent of the capitalization grant on or before the date on which the state receives each cash draw from EPA. These funds will be transferred from Idaho's Water Pollution Control Account.

G. State Laws and Procedures - 602(b)(7)

DEQ agrees to expend each quarterly grant payment in accordance with state laws and procedures.

H. Consistency with Planning

DEQ agrees that it will not provide assistance to any wastewater treatment project unless that project is consistent with plans developed under Section 205(j), 208, 303(e), 319, or 320.

I. Reporting

DEQ agrees to provide data or information to EPA as may be required for national

reports, public inquiries, or Congressional inquiries.

DEQ will comply with reporting requirements of the EPA Order on Environmental Benefits. This will include completion of the electronic “one-pager” for all funded projects. A hard copy of each “one-pager” will be provided to EPA with the Annual Report.

## VI. **Criteria and Method for Distribution Of Funds**

The following principles and procedures will be the basis for the administration, funding, allocation and distribution of the SRF monies. They are designed to provide maximum flexibility for assistance and assure long-term viability of the revolving program.

### A. Program Administration

Four percent of the capitalization grant provided by EPA will be set aside to be used for program administration.

### B. SRF Priority List

Letters of Interest were sent to all cities, counties and water and sewer districts in the state. Returned Letters of Interest and priority list rating forms were sent to Project Engineers in DEQ regional offices to complete a rating of projects in each region. The result of the rating and ranking was the preliminary priority list that was presented at the public hearing. Separate Letters of Interest were sent to potential non-point source applicants. Projects are rated using the following criteria:

1. 150 points                      - Public health emergency certified by the DEQ Board or a Health District Board
2. 0 to 100 points                - Watershed restoration
3. 0 to 100 points                - Watershed protection
4. 0 to 100 points                - Preventing impacts to uses
5. 0 to 50 points                 - Secondary incentive ranking points

Attachment III contains the guidance document which fully explains how DEQ staff applied the above criteria when rating individual projects.

### C. Fundable Projects

The highest rated projects on the adopted Priority List that are ready to proceed are selected for funding and are listed on the IUP. These fundable projects are listed on

Attachment I. DEQ staff starts at the top of the Priority List and works as far down the list as needed to select enough projects that are ready to proceed to use all of the funds that are available. In cases where a lower ranked project is selected it is because higher ranked projects have not indicated a readiness to proceed.

In some cases the project amount on Attachment I may be less than the project amount on the Priority List. The Priority List amount is the estimate of the total project cost, while the costs on Attachment I are the amount that project applicants expect to borrow from the SRF. In each case the difference will be provided from some other source such as cash on hand or a grant from the Community Development Block Grant program administered by the Idaho Department of Commerce.

D. Disbursements

The estimated timing and amount of disbursements for the projects on the new IUP are added to the latest cash disbursement request projections for prior year funded and projected projects. The projections are normally provided to EPA in July each year. The projections are based upon estimated disbursement schedules submitted by loan recipients and projected timing of loan agreements, adjusted for corrections by regional project engineers and state office staff. These disbursements are tracked on an on-going basis to project needed cash from all capitalization grants and state match. All funds will be expended in an expeditious and timely manner.

E. Federal Payments

Idaho's proposed payment schedule for each capitalization grant is based upon the projected timing of signed loan agreements with projects listed on the current and prior IUPs. This allows for adjustment of prior IUP projects to be reflected in the federal payment schedule.

F. State Match

Idaho's match for all capitalization grants is provided from funds that are drawn from the state Water Pollution Control Account. The Water Pollution Control Account derives its funding from a set amount of \$4.8 million from the state sales tax and is perpetually appropriated to DEQ under Idaho Code Title 63, Chapter 36.



## VII. Additional Information Requirements

### A. Public Review and Comment

Projects on the FY2006 SRF List of Fundable Projects and Project Priority List were approved by the DEQ Board at the June 23, 2005 meeting. Copies of the list were made available in the regional and state offices thirty days in advance of the hearing date. Also, notices of the priority list review process were printed in major Idaho newspapers at least 21 days prior to the hearing date. At the Boise hearing, DEQ delivered a thorough discussion of its intent to develop a priority list and IUP for the low-interest revolving loan program. This message was also included in public notices sent to Idaho newspapers and to a large list of private interested parties such as consulting engineers, local governments, and local government advocacy groups.

In addition to the above, the draft Intended Use Plan including the Fundable List and Project Priority List was posted on the DEQ website during the comment period.

### B. Bypass Procedures

A project that does not or will not meet the project target date or a DEQ schedule that allows for timely utilization of loan funds may be bypassed, substituting in its place the next highest ranking project(s) that is ready to proceed (Rules IDAPA 16.01.12020,06). DEQ intends to utilize priority list ranking as much as possible when preparing the Intended Use Plan. However the lack of adequate funding, changes in project scopes, failure to pass a bond election, or other unforeseen circumstances may require that a project on the Intended Use Plan be removed. If a project is removed, DEQ will offer loan funds to the highest ranked, ready-to-proceed project from the most current approved Priority List.

## ATTACHMENT I

### LIST OF FUNDABLE PROJECTS

<u>PROJECT</u>	Priority List <u>Number</u>	<u>LOAN AMOUNT</u>	BINDING COMMITMENT <u>DATE</u>
Administration		\$209,740	9/05
Ammon, City of	1	15,000,000	9/05
Reubens, City of	2	640,000	3/06
Greenleaf, City of*	3	1,050,000	3/06
Shelley, City of*	4	6,000,000	7/05
Spirit Lake, City of	5	150,000	3/06
Soda Springs, City of	6	4,000,000	3/06
Filer, City of*	7	3,147,000	12/05
Southside W&S District*	8	3,000,000	5/06
City of Bellevue	9	2,000,000	12/05
Jerome, City of	10	<u>7,854,768</u>	12/05
TOTAL		\$43,051,508	

\*Projects carried forward from Prior Year

Descriptions of the projects listed above are provided on the following pages.

## **LIST OF FUNDABLE PROJECTS - PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS**

<b>City of Ammon</b>	<b>(Bonneville County, Idaho Falls Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$15,000,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City will construct a new interceptor line to a new regional wastewater treatment facility at Shelley. Some of the funds will also be used to pay for construction of the treatment facility.		
<b>City of Reubens</b>	<b>(Lewis County, Lewiston Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$640,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City will construct a new secondary wastewater treatment system.		
<b>City of Greenleaf</b>	<b>(Canyon County, Boise Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$1,050,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City needs to install a new secondary wastewater treatment system.		
<b>City of Shelley</b>	<b>(Bingham County, Pocatello Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City will use the loan funds for the first phase of design and construction of a regional wastewater treatment facility. The facility will serve the City of Shelley, South Bonneville County, North Bingham County and the City of Ammon.		
<b>City of Spirit Lake</b>	<b>(Kootenai County, Coeur d'Alene Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City will use the loan funds to design and construct a sewer collection system for the Debbie-Tammy Subdivision.		
<b>City of Soda Springs</b>	<b>(Caribou County, Pocatello Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$4,000,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City will use the loan funds to design and construct an upgrade to their existing wastewater treatment facilities.		
<b>City of Filer</b>	<b>(Twin Falls County, Twin Falls Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$3,147,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City of Filer needs to upgrade their collection system and treatment facility. This includes installation of a comminutor at the headworks, upgrading aeration and removal of sludge from cells 1 and 2 and installation of flow monitoring equipment. This project will help address conditions in the City's new generation land application permit.		
<b>Southside Water and Sewer District</b>	<b>(Bonner County, Coeur d'Alene Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$3,000,000</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The District is completing a planning study to identify alternatives for upgrading their existing wastewater treatment facility to comply with the schedule in their Land Application Permit and to serve their 20-year design population.		
<b>City of Bellevue</b>	<b>(Blaine County, Twin Falls Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>
<i>Sec 212.</i> The City will expand the existing wastewater treatment facility to match their population growth and solve an existing nitrate problem.		
<b>City of Jerome</b>	<b>(Jerome County, Twin Falls Regional Office)</b>	<b>\$7,854,768</b>
<i>Sec.212.</i> The City will add new aeration to existing treatment facilities and will add new aeration basins to handle an increasing load of wastewater to the facility. Jerome will also develop new biosolids handling facilities. The project will help the city meet TMDL requirements for the middle Snake River as well as addressing conditions in the Odor Management Plan.		

**FY 2006 STATE WASTEWATER LOAN PRIORITY LIST**
**ATTACHMENT II**

WW LOAN										
Rank	Project	FY 2006 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit #	BOD	SS
1	City of Ammon	150	IFRO	15,000,000	I, IVB	New interceptor and treatment plant	4			
2	City of Reubens	150	LRO	640,000	I,IVA,B	Construct a new secondary system in Reubens	4			
3	City of Greenleaf	150	BRO	5,100,000	I,IVA-B	Construct a new secondary system in Greenleaf	4			
4	City of Shelley	143	PRO	6,000,000	I	Construct a new regional secondary wastewater treatment facility at Shelley.	4	ID0020133	45	70
5	City of Spirit Lake	140	CRO	150,000	IVA,B	Sewer collection system for the Debbie-Tammy Subdivision	4			
6	City of Soda Springs	137	PRO	4,000,000	I	Upgrade existing wastewater treatment facilities	4	ID0020818	30	30
7	City of Moscow	127	BRO	3,750,000	I	Constuction of a new effluent filtration system	4	ID0021491	30	30
8	City of Filer	121	TFRO	3,147,000	I,IIIB	Remove the sludge from the lagoons, add aeration, upgrade sewer mains	4	ID0020061	30	70
9	Southside Water and Sewer District	113	CRO	3,000,000	I,II	Upgrade the treatment facilities and add new WW land site	4			
10	City of Bellevue	112	TFRO	2,000,000	I	Expand existing treatment facilities to match population growth and to solve a nitrate problem	4			

Rank	Project	FY 2006 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit #	BOD	SS
11	City of Jerome	111	TFRO	8,067,000	I	Treatment upgrade, membrane technology	4	ID002016	30	30
12	City of Buhl	110	TFRO	14,000,000	I	Treatment system upgrade, aeration basin and, filtration	4	ID0020664	30	30
13	City of Gooding	105	TFRO	1,000,000	I	Upgrade existing wastewater treatment facilities to meet ammonia standards	4	ID0020028	30	30
14	South Bingham Soil Conservation District	100	PRO	350,000	VIIA	Purchase of additional land to be used to develop new wetland and riparian plant materials	4			
15	City of Deary	97	LRO	800,000	IIIA/I	Upgrade the treatment plant and add dechlorination, correct I/I	4	ID0020788	30	44
16	Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District	91	BRO	700,000	IVA-B	Smiling Julie/ Westwood Subdivision	4			
17	Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District	91	BRO	1,362,000	IVA-B	Royal Scott Subdivision	4			
18	City of Meridian	89	BRO	13,410,000	II	WWTP Upgrade	4	ID0020192	20	20
19	Hoodoo Water and Sewer District	88	LRO	630,000	I	Upgrade the mounded subsurface community system	4			
20	Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District	86	BRO	400,000	IVA-B	SISCRA RV Park	4			
21	City of Hailey	82	TFRO	760,000	I,IIIB	Collection system repairs and a wastewater treatment plant filtration upgrade	4	ID0020303	30	30

Rank	Project	FY 2006 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit #	BOD	SS
22	City of Heyburn	79	TFRO	1,000,000	I,IIIA	Upgrade the treatment plant to stay in compliance with the phosphorous limit.	4	ID0020940	30	30
23	City of Huetter	79	CRO	540,000	IVA,B	Install collection system and transmission line to the City of Coeur d'Alene for treatment	4			
24	City of Dietrich	75	TFRO	600,000	I	Finish land application system	4			
25	City of Tetonia	74	IFRO	900,000	I	Add disinfection, add pump for land application, make improvements to land application system	4			
26	City of Bloomington	67	PRO	300,000	I	Construct a third lagoon at the existing wastewater treatment facility	4			
27	City of Melba	63	BRO	3,100,000	I	Construction of a new holding pond and upgrade of treatment lagoons and related work	4			
28	City of Mountain Home	53	BRO	1,100,000	I	Increase the land application area for the City	4			
29	Lindsay Lateral Association	52	BRO	1,200,000	VIIA	Installation of a pressurized irrigation system	4			
30	City of Kuna	51	BRO	9,900,000	I	Installation of a membrane bio-reactor (MBR) filtration treatment plant	4			

Rank	Project	FY 2006 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit #	BOD	SS
31	City of Nampa	51	BRO	3,500,000	I	Construction of a new clarifier and second primary digester	4	ID002206-3	30	30
32	Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District	39	BRO	400,000	IVA	Collection and pumping station	4			
33	Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District	39	BRO	3,950,000	IVA-B	Collection system and parallel pressure sewer line	4			
34	Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District	39	BRO	6,000,000	I	Treatment plant expansion	4			

I Secondary Treatment      III Infiltration/Inflow Correction      IVA New Collector Sewers      V Combined Sewer Overflows  
 II Advanced Treatment      IIIB Replacement/Rehabilitation      IVB New Interceptor Sewers      VI Storm Sewer

**WARNING: USE OF THIS LIST AS A MAILING LIST OR AS A TELEPHONE NUMBER LIST IS PROHIBITED BY IDAHO CODE SECTION 9-348 AND IS PUNISHABLE BY A CIVIL PENALTY OF UP TO 1,000.**

FINAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

PRIORITY YEAR \_\_\_\_\_

**GUIDANCE FOR INTEGRATED PRIORITY SYSTEM:****WATER QUALITY PROJECT RANKING****DEQ Water Pollution Control Loan Program**

PROJECT NAME \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT ADDRESS (*Street? P.O. Box*) \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Rating \_\_\_\_\_

Project Rater \_\_\_\_\_ Regional Office \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION I - INTEGRATED PRIORITY SYSTEM**

An integrated priority system will be used by the Department to annually allot available funds to water quality projects determined eligible for funding assistance under the water pollution control loan program in accordance with the Rules for Administration (16.01.12). Each water quality project will be ranked by the integrated priority system in accordance with this guidance.

Following in **Section I** are four major rating categories, **A, B, C and D**. Answer “**Yes**” to the rating category that best fits your project then answer the questions related to that category in the appropriate **subsection (A, B, C or D) in Section II**. If the subject project does not fit any of the rating categories (i.e., you answer “**NO**” to all four questions) then the project is not eligible for further funding considerations by the DEQ Loans Program.

**A) Public Health Emergency or Public Health Hazard:** Will the proposed project eliminate an officially declared or designated water-borne public health hazard or public health emergency?  
If YES, go to page 2

**B) Watershed Restoration:** Will the proposed project address watershed restoration as identified in the *Unified Watershed Assessment and Restoration Priorities for Idaho*?

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No      If YES, go to page 2

**C) Watershed Protection from Impacts:** Will the proposed project address watershed protection as identified in the *State Water Quality Standards* or the *Idaho Ground Water Quality Rule*?

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No      If YES, go to page 5

**D) Preventing Impacts to Uses:** Will the proposed project addresses preventing watershed degradation?

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No      If YES, go to page 6

If you have answered **Yes** to a category in this Section (Section I), please advance to Sections II and



**III and answer questions in the appropriate subsections.**

**SECTION II - WATER QUALITY PROJECT RANKING**

Only statewide initiatives or regional on-the-ground implementation project proposals that have answered “Yes” to a subsection in **Section I** may continue for ranking consideration under **Section II**.

**A. Public Health Emergency or Public Health Hazard (Bypasses Section III)**

Emergency*	<u>150</u>
No Emergency	<u>0</u>

**\*Note: An emergency is an officially declared or designated public health hazard or emergency that is a documented health threat certified by a Health District Board or Environmental Quality Board.**

**Section II. A Points** \_\_\_\_\_  
**(0 or 150 pts)**

**B. Watershed Restoration**

The project implements best management practices or initiates construction or wastewater collection and treatment facilities as part of an approved TMDL, protects threatened waters identified through the States Nonpoint Source Management Program plan, or is part of a special water quality effort (i.e., Governors Bull Trout Conservation Plan, etc.). **Score the subject project under numbers 1 and 2 of Watershed Restoration.**

1. Status - Points can be assigned based upon the status in the TMDL schedule, priority of the listed 303(d) water, implications to threatened or endangered species, impacts to a sole source aquifer, impacts to an outstanding resource water or impacts to sensitive, or special resource ground water, or compliance with an NPDES permit. **Select a subpart (a., b, c or d) and complete a rating for the subject project.**

**a. No Status**

Not included on a current 303 (d) list, not on a TMDL schedule, not out of compliance with a NPDES permit, not part of a known special surface or groundwater category or listing, or does not effect listed threatened or endangered species. 0 Pts

**b. Low Status**

Project is Located on a low priority 303(d) water body on the 8-year TMDL schedule (2005 or further out on the 8-year schedule) \_\_\_\_\_8pts

- Status of the TMDL in project subbasin:

-TMDL completed but not approved	No 0 pts /Yes 5 pts	_____
-TMDL Approved by EPA	No 0 pts/Yes 5 pts	_____
-TMDL Implementation Plan approved by DEQ	No 0 pts/Yes 5 pts	_____

- Expected benefits to a sole-source aquifer and other ground water resources (based on

available maps showing boundaries of sole source aquifers on Rathdrum Prairie, Eastern Snake River Plain, and Lewiston Basin).

Outside \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 Borderline \_\_\_\_\_ 3  
 Within boundary \_\_\_\_\_ 5

- Expected reduction in impacts to threatened and endangered Species.

Low \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3  
 High \_\_\_\_\_ 5

- Current level of compliance with NPDES and land application permit.

Low \_\_\_\_\_ 5  
 Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3  
 High \_\_\_\_\_ 1

**Subtotal** \_\_\_\_\_

**c. Medium Status**

Project is Located on a medium priority 303(d) water body on the 8-year TMDL Schedule (2003 or 2004 on the 8-year schedule) \_\_\_\_\_ 12pts

- Status of the TMDL in project subbasin:

-TMDL completed but not approved No 0 pts / Yes 5 pts \_\_\_\_\_  
 -TMDL Approved by EPA No 0 pts / Yes 5 pts \_\_\_\_\_  
 - TMDL Implementation Plan approved by DEQ No 0 pts / Yes 5 pts \_\_\_\_\_

- Expected benefits to a sole-source aquifer and other ground water resources.

Low \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3  
 High \_\_\_\_\_ 5

- Expected reduction in impacts to threatened and endangered Species.

Low \_\_\_\_\_ 1  
 Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3  
 High \_\_\_\_\_ 5

- Current level of compliance with NPDES and Land Application permits

Low \_\_\_\_\_ 5  
 Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3  
 High \_\_\_\_\_ 1

**Subtotal** \_\_\_\_\_

**d. High Status**

Project is located on a high priority 303(d) water body according to the 8-year TMDL

schedule

\_\_\_\_\_20pts

- Status of the TMDL in project subbasin:
  - TMDL completed but not approved No 0 pts / Yes 5 pts \_\_\_\_\_
  - TMDL Approved by EPA No 0 pts / Yes 5 pts \_\_\_\_\_
  - TMDL Implementation Plan approved by DEQ No 0 pts / Yes 5 pts \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 
- Impacts to a sole-source aquifer and other ground water resources
  - Low \_\_\_\_\_ 1
  - Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3
  - High \_\_\_\_\_ 5
- Expected benefits reduction in impacts to threatened and endangered Species.
  - Low \_\_\_\_\_ 1
  - Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3
  - High \_\_\_\_\_ 5
- Level of compliance with NPDES and Land Application permits
  - Low \_\_\_\_\_ 5
  - Medium \_\_\_\_\_ 3
  - High \_\_\_\_\_ 1

**Subtotal** \_\_\_\_\_  
(0 to 50 Pts)

2. Potential for Restoration Points - Points are awarded according to the expected effectiveness of the project and the transferability of the demonstrated technologies to other parts of the State of Idaho. The proposed project will either restore designated or existing beneficial uses, reduce the severity of nonpoint source impacts, or the project will promote statewide nonpoint pollution reduction or remediation. **Select one subpart below.**

- a. No load reduction or effectiveness calculations provided 0 Pts
- b. Improvements are minor (ex. <25% estimated reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require substantial capital/manpower commitment: 15 Pts
- c. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored and the impacts are reduced (ex. >25% reduction but <75% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require moderate capital/ manpower commitment: 30 Pts
- d. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored or the impacts are reduced (ex. >75% reduction but <100% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require minimal capital/manpower commitment: 50 Pts

**Section II. B Points** \_\_\_\_\_  
**(0 to 101 pts)**

---

**C. Watershed Protection from Impacts**

**Score the subject project under number 1, 2, and 3 of Watershed Protection from Impacts.**

1. Points will be assigned based upon: the number of stream miles impacted; the number of lake/reservoir surface acres impacted; the extent of groundwater impacts to beneficial uses or; ability of a statewide project to promote point- or nonpoint source pollution reduction or mitigation. Proposed project applicants must include a map showing the impact area of the proposed water quality projects to receive more than the minimal score.

**Select a Subpart (a, b, c, or d) and complete the rating for the subject project.**

- a. Low Impact - Little evident impact is noted due to point- or nonpoint source contribution or statewide NPS project initiatives (i.e., less than 5 miles or 200 acres effected or minor impacts to ground water): 5 Pts
  - b. Moderate Impact - Moderate impact is noted due to point- or nonpoint source contributions or statewide NPS project initiatives (i.e., approximately 5 miles or 200 acres effected or moderate impacts to ground water). 15 Pts
  - c. High Impact - Severe impact is noted due to point source (i.e., under administrative, or consent order) or nonpoint source contribution (i.e., more than 5 miles or 200 acres effected or severe impacts to ground water) or statewide NPS project initiatives: 35 Pts
2. Potential for Restoration Points - Points are awarded according to the expected effectiveness of the project and the transferability of the demonstrated technologies to other parts of the State of Idaho. The proposed project will either restore designated or existing beneficial uses, reduce the severity of point- or nonpoint source impacts, or the project will promote statewide nonpoint pollution reduction or remediation.  
(Select one subpart below)
    - a. No load reduction or effectiveness calculations provided: 0 Pts
    - b. Improvements are minor (ex. <25% estimated reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require substantial capital/manpower commitment: 5 Pts
    - c. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored and the documented impacts are reduced (ex. >25% reduction but <75% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require moderate capital/manpower commitment: 15 Pts
    - d. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored and the documented impacts are reduced (ex. >75% reduction but <100%

reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require minimal capital/manpower commitment:

35 Pts

3. Nexus/benefit to municipality - Points are awarded based on the commitment of a municipality to directly benefit for implementing or financing a portion of the proposed project. A municipality-driven project is awarded the maximum 30 points.

Community/Agency Support

- a. No support letters. 0 Pts
- b. One to Two support letters. 10 Pts
- c. Three or more support letters OR municipal-driven project. 30 Pts

**Section II. C Points** \_\_\_\_\_  
**(0 to 100 pts)**

**D. Preventing Impacts to Uses**

**Score project under numbers 1, 2, and 3 of Preventing Impacts and Uses.**

1. Points will be assigned based upon the documented number of designated beneficial uses impacted by nonpoint source pollutants. **Select a subpart (a, b, c, or d) and complete a rating for the subject project.**

Number of use Impacts:

- a. No Impacts 0 Pts
- b. One or Two Uses 10 Pts
- c. Three or Four Uses 25 Pts
- d. Four or more Uses 40 Pts

2. Nexus/benefit to municipality - Points are awarded based on the commitment of a municipality for implementing or financing a portion of the proposed project. **(Select one subpart below.)**

Community/Agency Support

- a. No support letters. 0 Pts
- b. One to Two support letters. 20 Pts
- c. Three or more support letters. 40 Pts

3. State and National Priorities - Points will be assigned based upon recognition of the special status of waters or uses of those waters.

**Instruction: answer statements below: a, b, or c or any combination:**

- a. State Priorities - The project impacts either: a State Park or State Recreational Area, a blue

ribbon fishery, water classified as a special or outstanding resource water, or designated as part of a sole source aquifer, an area of high ground water vulnerability, or the project enhances the State's nonpoint source management program.

10 Pts

- b. National Priorities - A nonpoint source or statewide initiative project is intended to positively impact either: a threatened or endangered species, a wilderness area, a Wild and Scenic River or a sole source aquifer.

10 Pts

- c. Not Applicable

0 Pts

**Section II. D Points**

                      
**(0 to 100 pts)**

**SECTION II-WATER QUALITY PROJECT RANKING**

**SUBTOTAL POINTS =**                       
**(0 to 100 pts)**

---

**SECTION III - SECONDARY 'INCENTIVE' PROJECT RANKING**

All projects are ranked under Section III criteria, which are established for use to further rank Water Quality Project Ranking from Section II of the Guidance. Answer the following set of questions specifically as it relates to the project. Each answer that receives points accordingly should be subtotaled for Section III and added to the score from Section II for "Grand Total Points." **Answer one per question and sum the cumulative in the Subtotal.**

1. Is project ready to proceed (for NPS Project ONLY            Yes = 11 pts;            No = 0 pts)

No Facility Plan	<u>          </u> 0 pts
Consultant hired for Facility Plan Preparation	<u>          </u> 3 pts
Draft Facility Plan	<u>          </u> 5 pts
Approved Facility Plan and Environmental Review Completed	<u>          </u> 7 pts
10% or more (Preliminary) Design Completed	<u>          </u> 9 pts

2. Resulting monthly user service (charges) rates as an outcome of the project (e.g., hardship, etc.).

up to \$20	<u>          </u> 3 pts
\$20 to \$30	<u>          </u> 6 pts
> \$30	<u>          </u> 9 pts

3. Is financial documentation in place to ensure payback assurance?

No Plan	<u>          </u> 0 pts
---------	-------------------------

Bond council or financial consultant retained \_\_\_\_\_ 5 pts  
Legal instrument(s) in place (e.g., bond election, bylaws, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_ 9 pts

4. Project will correct a water quality impact being created by current point or non-point wastewater disposal practices. \_\_\_\_\_ 3, 6 or 9 pts
5. Project will correct an existing or potential health hazard (not emergency) being created by current point or non-point wastewater disposal practices. \_\_\_\_\_ 7, 11 or 14 pts

**Section III**      **Points** \_\_\_\_\_  
**(0 to 50 Pts)**

**GRAND TOTAL POINTS** \_\_\_\_\_  
**(0 to 150 Pts)**

**EPA PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

FFY2005 IUP

<u>Quarter Ending</u>	<u>Payments</u>	<u>Total</u>
9/2005	\$209,740	\$209,740
12/2005	5,033,760	5,243,500

Payments are defined as increases to the amount of funds available from the Automated Clearinghouse (ACH).



PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY

FOR

FY-2006 WASTEWATER AND DRINKING WATER PRIORITY LISTS

The public was involved in the FY2006 priority list development at several points in the process. Involvement for the drinking water and water pollution control lists was the same -needs were solicited directly from the systems through a survey mailed out by the DEQ early in the priority list process. Information on the completed survey forms was used in part by the State and Regional office staff in preparing draft lists. A copy of the survey form and the cover letter that was sent with it are included as attachments here. We are finding that combining information obtained directly from eligible entities with that provided by our engineering staff results in the most accurate listing of infrastructure needs.

Notification that all four FY2006 priority lists were available for public review was given in Idaho's six major (regional) newspapers for approximately twenty-one days prior to a hearing on the lists in Boise. Notices were published three times in each of the newspapers. Copies of proofs of publication are included as attachments here.

The hearing was held on May 16, 2005.

Notification of availability of the lists was also placed on DEQ's web site starting twenty-one days prior to the hearing. A copy of the web site cover page is included here.

Separate letters of notification of availability of the lists were sent to all entities included on all four lists approximately twenty-one days prior to the hearing. In those letters we explained that the lists would be available for review at our regional and state offices and on the Internet.

Approval packages related to the four lists were sent to the Board of Environmental Quality prior to their meeting on June 23, 2005. Copies of the Issue Analyses for the SRF loan lists and the Board agenda are included as attachments here. DEQ staff made presentations at the Board meeting on June 23 and answered questions about the lists. The Board approved all lists on June 23.